GRS IX 5]

Previous references. (1922-23 Misc)

File No. 459-22

Serial Nos. 10-15

Later references.

459-22-1-9 & 16-23.

Misc 1800-27-1

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos. 10-15

Part B for July 25 Dec 29

SUBJECT

Siva puja Wrd. re Case

Orders passed separately.
Pleasure No 131-3 & 28.7.25

This may be
sent to Rev &
Protection
Branch

Re Supply
Rev &
Protection
Branch
with compliments
PS Kennedy

Noting
whether
the subject matter
~~has not been~~ the services
this case
not pertain
to Rev &
19-12-23.

Summons
may be
sent to
Rev &
Branch

11/2/23

E GOVERNMENT SERVICE.

te,

District.

G.R. S. III[illegible]3]

2653

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions etc., not intended for permanent record.]

Rec'd

2. The summons is for service. After service, action if any would have to be taken as per orders then made if necessary, the Office Branch may return the summons after service -

3. The original may be signed returned and the duplicate retained, to be sent to the Govt advocate to appear and to the record

Chief Secy

Cay 20/12

Secretariat

4. Please hand over to Signed & Govt advocate

5) Please return the original Summons to the Chief Court together with previous reference if any, If necessary it may be ascertained to what branch the case refers to & references obtained

Cay 21/12

) Submitted with a draft. Information as regards the subject matter of which has been called for from the Regr After the receipt of information, the file will be transferred to the Branch to the subject matter relates

29/12/25

V B—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form

G. R S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc, not intended for permanent record

---

7 Issue. The Chief Court is not bound ~~to~~ to give us details - maybe ascertained from the Branch Concerned

cas
29.1.24

No 1 of 3526(1) 9 2/1/24

To the Regr Civ Court

Returns with notice duly signed by the Sole Surg.

Subd

8) In a previous case the G A was requested to appear on behalf of Govt in the Chief Court. In a similar draft now submitted the G A has been requested to get the confirmation and report the fact After the receipt of the letter reply the file may be sent to the Branch to which the subject matter reported relates for previous References Then Cause is suggested as it is not easy from the mere remarks that is given in the notice to find out to which Branch the ~~Appeal~~ relates

Subd with D Draft

Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form

W D 1886—GTB—150 000—25—1

5/1/24

9) Draft maybe approved

cas

LH Secy

10) Approved 8/1

11) Issue cas 8/1

9.1

R. S. (III—3]

Mug. 459-22 2 2 8

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record]

Dr—

The S. A. Letter rec'd 18/25/24 states that there is an appeal against the order of Dr. Medical of the Sub-Divisional Bangalore re the partition and possession of one half of the Total Village of Kempalingapura in the Devanhalli Taluk and that the entire file was returned to the Revenue Dept. by Govt.

12) This is a Mysore Department case. May be transferred to that Dept. if approved — yes. as 29/

28/11/24

923

Mysore

30/11/24

13) Mug. 7. no. 459 of 1922 on the subject is linked. The matter is under correspondence with the Mug. Govt. in the matter regards to the Govt. Adv's Bill for having conducted the case in the Bangalore Sub Judge's Court —

14) The party has appa

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be cipoed, or slips pasted on this form.

Mag. 459-22. Mag 923

4

G R S. III—3],

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

---

to the chief Court, and the first Bde has already been requested to defend the suit. There seems to be nothing to be done now Later on, if the first Bde asks for the connected files, they may be sent to them. Subject. The date of hearing is 11-2-1924.

Perused

AG 30-1-24

12.24

SD 30.1.24

Rec. Regd

Mag with Compts

15) Seen

Rec'd with Compts

N B Shouldroutine notes be written on small slips the notes must b cipoed, or slips pasted on this form

G. R. S. III—3]

Mwz. 459-22.

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

From, the Sub Asst
Letter no. 658 Dy 6. 3. 24

States that an order was passed in the Chief Court directing the apltt Sivagnya Vodigar to furnish security aggregating Rs 1125/- for the said costs, and that 3 months' time is given to him for the purpose, and adds that a Sum of Rs 2/- has been advanced for purchasing the Stamps for the applications which may be sent to his office.

Submits. 16) This charge will have to be met from Law Charges

AA 13/3/24.

N B -Shouldroutine notes be written on small slips the notes must b cipoed, or slips pasted on this form

In the absence of any [illegible] papers may perhaps be [illegible] 17) What is about,

RA 13/3/24

b

G. R. S. III—3]

923
1118

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record]

---

18) Muz: T. no. 459 – 22
on the subject, is put up.
Siddappa Udeya's case is
that the post village of
Kempalingapura in the
Devanahalli Taluk, which
has been ordered to be
made over to Hunchimanahalli
Mutt in the said Taluk
may be given over to him
Sd/-

15/3/24

15/3/24

Mr has perhaps to be
said from the file
Mr with
21.3.24.

2 to be noted

N. B—Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be cipoed, or slips pasted on this form.

923

G. R. S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record]

19) This will have to be paid from the same source from which Govt Advs. per are paid. Please Ref to a note requesting this be called before the End of this month

D
22.3.24.

Offr. Submitted.

AL 22/3/24 RH 22/3/24

21) Done
D
25. 3.24.

12 To the Surgeon Commr. No. 1330 d. 28.3.24. Fds copy of the above letter and requests that the report called for in Ob. 9 may be rendered so as to reach this office not later than the 31st

To the Govt Advocate. No. 1225 d. 28.3.24. Fds copy of the above for info.

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

ST
3/4/3

G. R. S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not inte

nall sh ps
the notes must b cipoed, oc sups pasted on
this form

1195

F. S. III. 2]

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. 459 of 1922

Serial No.

13 From the Muz: Com: No 492 & 31.3.24. stating that on the Muz 231-28 does not throw much light on the case, he has written to the Govt Advocate to furnish him with the necessary papers &c.

22) The further report in the subject may be awaited.

23) Bring this and if you have anymore papers on the subject then

BL 2.4.24 U.U.M.

24) The Office file relative to Siriapuje Vader's O. Suit on the file of the Sub Judge, Bangalore, is linked herein Submits.

AV 8/4/24 BL 8/4/24

25) A reminder may be sent to expedite the report

U U M. 9/4/24

AV 9.4.24.

26) D/F. Revenue Submits.

AV 10/4/24 BL 10/4/24

27) Done U U M. 11.4.24

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0561—GPB—3750—1 8 22

III.2]

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. 459 of 1922

Serial No.

14. To, The Muz Comr, no 1446 D/16/4/24
Requests him to expedite the submission of his report.

15. From. The Muz Comr.
Letter no C 492 D 5-6-1924
Recommends that the amount of Rs 302/ may be advanced from State funds as no other source can be thought of at the close of the official year, the advance being recpd on recovery of court costs from the Plaintiff.

Fgo H. Sh

Submits for orders
AD
11-6-24

Sh

Sh

20) Sanction is solicited to the Supl Estimate for Rs 300, and also to a sum of Rs 24 being the value of the Cs attached to an application of the Ch Court by the Asst P

NOTE—Contn sheet

21) No charge has [illegible] to be met

H.C. 146

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. | of 192

Serial No.

Can the question of fees to Advocates and under Law charges under 18 Court of Law 2. Law officers. The Fin'l Secty may perhaps be consulted

D/ 13.6.24.

Rec'd Secy 30) Yes Secy

D/ 14.6.24.

Fin'l Secty with compts 39) If this is an amount recoverable from any municipal institution, it has now to be paid as an advance and recouped later on. It cannot be charged to final heads as proposed above

The advance shd be credited to Local Funds

Secy 16/6/24

32) Submitted for orders.

MAV. 4.7.24.

33) Sanction of D/ 5.7.24.

34) The suit is on behalf of Hanumanahalli Math. The Math authorities have to be asked to deposit amount from the Math funds. If appd, a compt will be issued.

WD 0361—GPB—3750—1 8 22

D/ 12.7.24

Rec'd Secy 35) Yes Secy

D/ 14.7.24

NOTE—Contn. sheet

Serial No.

Note

A (7 no 38 1904-05)

40) In G.O no 4004-7 Dy 17-3-06, The jodi Village of Kempalingapura was directed to be resumed and taken under Govt management, That a notice of 6 months should be given to the Maurasidda Vadeer holder of the Village, to establish his claims if any. and that Thereafter it would be decided whether the Village would be transferred To Hunsomarnahalli Matt.

B

41) In G.O. no. 1329-31/Muz. 46-06 Dy 23-9-1908, Sidda Vadeer's review application for a re-consideration of the order of 1906 was rejected and the Village was ordered to be registered in the name of the Hunsomarnahalli Matt and title deed was issued accordingly.

Sidda Vadeer having memorialized His Highness the Maharaja

WD 0561-GPB-3750-1-8-22-

G. R. S. III. 2]

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. 4137 of 192 –

Serial No.	
	on the subject, the connected papers were submitted to H.H. as called for, and H. H. was pleased to order as follows:—
C	"I see no reason to interfere and the petr may be informed accordingly."
C1	An eyot no. 423 dy 12-12-1908 was issued.
D	42) In this office cmnr no. 1764/Mysore 97-08 dy 30-4-1909, the My Cmnr was requested to make over the village to Hunsomanahalli Math
	Sivaprije Vader filed a suit (no. 77 of 1918-9) in the Sub Judge's Court, Bangalore District, against the Mysore Govt, and it was decided against Sivaprije Vader. The Govt Advocate who conducted the case, has
E1	sent up a bill for Rs 300/ being his remuneration for professional services rendered by

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0561—GPB—3750—1 8 22

Serial No.

7

43) The Govt Advocate requests that a Sum of Rs 2/- now which was advanced from his office for purchasing the Stamp for the application, may also be paid to him.— Thus the total amount to be paid to the Govt Advocate is Rs 302/-.

44) The Muzrai Comr who was asked to point out the source, reports that the amount may be advanced from State funds as no other source could be traced at the close of the official year, the advance being recouped on recovery of court costs from the Plaintiff.

(No C 492 Dy 5-6-1924)

✓

With the Asst Secretary and Rev Secretary suggested that the charge might be met from the provision "Fees to Advocates and under Law Charges"

W&U661—GPF—100—4-22—15—

III. 2]

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. 1 of 192 —

Serial No.

Court of Law 2. Law Officers &c

45) The Fin. Secretary who was consulted in the matter, was of opinion as noted below:—

"If this is an amount recoverable from any muzrai instn., it has now to be paid as an advance and recouped later on. It cannot be charged off to final heads as proposed above. The advance should also be made from the funds of the instn."

46) Thereupon under Rev. Secretary's order, a Dft. is put up to the muzrai comr. reporting that the Hunsomanahalli Math authorities on behalf of whom the above suit was conducted may be asked to pay Rs.

WD 0561—GPB—3750—1 8 22

Serial No.

amount from the said firm.

47) Shiapuje Vader has appealed to the High Court, and the Govt Advocate states that this individual has been called upon to furnish security for costs incurred viz 1125/- and 3 months' time has been allowed to him (vide letter No. 6588 6-3-1924.

Submit for orders.

26.7.24 26.7.24

30.7.24.

7

116/6.8 2nd member 48/- Shown as an on an to the Govt fee

12/8
11/8

WD 0561—GPB—3750—1 8 22

23938

3228 / 17

WD 978—GPB—500—22-11-21

No. 528



OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE IN MYSORE,
Dated Bangalore...25th...January...192 4.

25/1/24

FROM

The Government Advocate in Mysore,
BANGALORE.

Mwz. 459-22-10.

To

The Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Local & Legislative Departments,
BANGALORE.

SIR

With reference to your letter No. P.3822/Cts. dated the 9th January 1924, I have the honour to - state that Regular Appeal No.155 of 1923-24 (Sivapooje Wodeyar VS. Government of Mysore) on the file of the Chief Court of Mysore, is an appeal from the Decree of the Subordinate Judge of Bangalore, in - Original Suit No.77 of 1918-19 on his file. The suit was for partition and possession of one half of the Jodi Village of Kempalingapura in the Devanahalli Taluq, said to have been granted as a personal Inam to the Plaintiff's Ancestors in the year 1812,

and

and for the recovery of a sum of Rs.1,500/- towards Mesne profits prior to the suit. The Subordinate Judge dismissed the suit with costs, and the present appeal is from that decree. This is a case in which I appeared on behalf of Government in the Original Suit also before the Lower Court, under instructions from the Joint Secretary to Government, Muzrai Department, - conveyed in his letter No.1962/Muz.231-18-3 dated 23rd January 1919, and the entire file of records connected with the case, was forwarded to the - Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, with this Office letter No.362 dated the 6th December 1923.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Government Advocate.

WD 978—GPB—500—22-11-21

The previous letter of the
first Advocate has
been sent to the
Munsif Sadr as the
case relates to that
Sadr (vide D no 3228 of 1924)
Sadr. This may also
be transferred to that
Sadr

25
5.24

To the Munsif
Sadr
with compliments
Ld
11/3

AV
11/3

WD 978—GPB—500—22-11-21

No. 658

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE IN MYSORE
Dated Bangalore 5th ...March..... *192* 4.

Inward No. 1118
12/3/24

FROM

The Government Advocate in Mysore, Mwz. 459-22-11.
BANGALORE.

To

The Secretary to the Government
of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Local & Legislative Departments,
BANGALORE.

SIR,

In the matter of Regular Appeal No.155/1923-24 on the file of the Chief Court of Mysore, (Sivapooje Wodeyar, VS. Government of Mysore).

---oOo---

With reference to correspondence ending with this Office letter No.528 dated the 25th January 1924, I have the honour to state that, having come to know, in the above case, that the Appellant was not in a position to pay our costs, I filed an application before the Chief Court, on the 28th February 1924, for calling upon the Appellant to furnish security for costs incurred in the Lower Court as also in this Court, aggregating to about Rs.1125/- in all (including the Court Fee of Rs.475/- payable to Government in the Lower Court, on account of the suit having been admitted in forma pauperis). The application came on for Hearing this day (5-3-1924) and an order was passed directing the Appellant to furnish security for the said costs and 3 month's time is given to him for the said purpose.

2. A sum of Rs.2/- only has been advanced from this Office, in this connection, for purchasing the Stamp for the application,

application, and I request you will kindly arrange to send the same to this Office, at an early date.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Government Advocate.

Muz 4]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

Section Muz.
File No. 459-22
Serial No. 12

Muzrai Secretariat

( )

, the 192 2 June

No. 1334

Date of issue 28-3-24

To

The Muzrai Commr

Signed by M.T. Kamath

Sir,

In directing ref. to this office Cir. no. 1018-Muz 459-22 dt 26-1-1924 requesting information as regards the source from which the cost of the Govt Advs Bill for having conducted O.S. no. 77 of 1918-9 on the file of the Sub Judge, Bangalore (Sriarupje waderu vs Govt.)

28/3/24

over.

C^W

To forward herewith a copy
of letter no. 658 dy 6-3-1924
from the Govt Advr in Mysore
requesting that a sum of Rs 24
being the amount advanced
from his office for
purchasing stamps, may
be sent to him, and to
request that the sub-
~~mission~~ of the report already called for
may be ~~expedited~~ submitted
so as to reach his office
not later than the 31st inst.

I have etc.

Sd/- [illegible]
Asst Rev. Secretary.

Sd/ 24/3/24

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

Copy to Govt Advocate for info

MYD 0263- GPB -2,500—27 7-22

Sd/- [illegible]

Sd/ 24/3/24

Urgent

·23

Muzrai
OFFICE OF THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

Bangalore, 31st March 192 4

No. C 492/23-4
one

D 1199
Muz: 459-22-13.



K.Chandy, Esq, B.A.
Revenue Commissioner in Mysore.
Muzrai

ST 4/24

K.V.Anantaraman, Esq, B.A.
Secretary to Government of H.H.
the Maharaja of Mysore,
Revenue Department.

SIR.

In reply to your letter No.1334/M.F.459-22-13 dated 28th March 1924 requesting me to submit my report not later than the 31st instant in re the claim of the Government Advocate for Rs.300/- in respect of his services rendered in O.S.No.77 of 18-19 on the file of the Sub Judge, Bangalore (Sivapuje Waderu Vs. Government) I have the honour to invite kind reference to my letter No.492 dated 27th December 1923 stating that there were no references in this office and that the case was conducted at the instance of the joint Secretary to Government, Muzrai Department, and that no definite opinion could be expressed as to the source from which the cost might be met.

On receipt of the collection (Muz.F.231-13) sent with your letter No.1018 dated 26th January 1924 it was ~~farmm~~ found that it did not throw much light on the point and therefore I addressed the Government Advocate in my letter No.C.492/23-24 dated 2nd February 1924 (copy enclosed for reference) to furnish me with the connected papers pertaining to the case and his reply is still due.

P.T.O.

74

He has been again reminded.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.

M.A.N.

Letter No.c.492 of 23-24 dated 2nd Fenruary 1924 from the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore to the Government Advocate, Bangalore.

==========

With reference to your letter No.363 dated the 6th December 1923 stating that the case re Sivapuje Waderu the Government of Mysore was conducted at the instance of the joint Secretary to Government,Muzrai Department, I have the honour to state that the Secretary to Government,Revenue Department who was requested to forward the connected papers sent the file. But the papers received do not throw any light on the facts of the case as it ends only with a letter to you requesting to appear and contest the application of Sivapuje Waderu to sue in forma paupers. I request therefore that you will be so good as to kindly intimate the result of the case amd also of O.S.No.77 of 18-19 said to be a continuation of the Proceedings initiated by filing Mis. application No.184 of 18-19. The papers pertaining thereto, if any in your office may also be kindly sent for reference and return.

" C O P Y"

For Muzrai Commissioner.

BR

Muz 4]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

Section Muz.
File No. 459-22
Serial No. 1[illegible]

Muzrai Secretariat
( )
, *the* 192 .

No. 1464

Date of issue 6.4.24

To The Muz. Com?

Signed by Mr. Ramaiya

Sir,

I am directed to invite ref. to your communication no. C. 492 of 31-3-1924, promising further report regarding the claim of the Govt. Advocate for ~~Rs~~ 300/- in respect of his services rendered in O.S. no. 44 of 18-19 on the file of the Sub Judge, Bangalore.

over.

Sivaprije Vadeyar

To request a ~~very early~~
~~Despatch~~ Transcript that the report called for
may be supplied.
By order
[illegible]
Secretary to Govt.
Rec. Dept.
10/4/24

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

WD 0563—GPB—2,500—27-7-22

C 492 of 23-4
one more file

Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Dated Bangalore, 5th J u n e 1924.

From

K. Chandy, Esquire., B.A.,

Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

B a n g a l o r e.

To

K. V. Anantaraman, Esquire., B.A.,

Secretary to the Government of

His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

Revenue Department.

D No. 2297
Muz. 459-22-14

Sir,

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter No.1444 M.F.459-22-14 dated 16th April 1924 requesting me to point out the --- source as to how the claim of Rs.300/- by the Government advocate for - services rendered in C.S.No.77 of 18-19 on the file of the Sub Judge -- Bangalore, and a sum of Rs.2/- being the value of the stamp affixed to an application filed by him before the Chief Court when an appeal was - preferred by the Plaintiff against the order of the Lower Court dismissing the case with costs, can be met I have the honor to forward herewith copy of Government Advocates letter No.300 dated 21st May 1924 stating that the entire file was returned to your office with his letter No.362 dated 6th December 1923 and that the appeal is still pending disposal -- before the Chief Court, and to state that in these circumstances the -- amount of Rs.302/- may be advanced from State Funds as no other source --- can be thought of at the close of the official year, the advance being recouped on recovery of court costs from the Plaintiff. The Muzrai File 213-18 received with your letter No.1018 dated 26th January 1924 is herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.

KSR.

Letter No.800 dated 21st May 1924 from the Government Advocate in Mysore to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

"With reference to correspondence ending with your letter No. 492 of 1923-24, dated the 22nd April 1924, I have the honor to state that original Suit No.77 of 1918-19 on the file of the Subordinate -- Judge, Bangalore,(Sivapooje Wodeyar Vs. The Government of Mysore) was dismissed with costs on the 31st March 1923. The entire file of -- papers relating to this case were returned to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, with this office letter No.362 dated the 6th December 1923, and no other references are available in this office.

The Plaintiff has now filed an appeal to the Chief Court --- (Regular Appeal No.155 of 1923-24) against the Decree of the Subordinate Judge, and on the 28th February 1924 I filed an application before the Chief Court for calling upon the appellant to furnish security for costs and the further claim of Rs.2/- to which you refer to in your letter -- dated the 31st March 1924 is in respect of the stamp affixed to the said application. The appeal is still pending disposal before the Chief -- Court."

"C o p y"

for Muzrai Commissioner. 5/6/24

KSR.

Muz 4]

SUBJECT ....

....

... .

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

Section

File No.

Serial No.

Muzrai Secretariat

( )

, the *192* .

No.

Date of issue _____

To

The Muznai Comr

Signed by _____

Sir,

Adverting to Correspondence ending with your letter No. C. 492 Dt. 5th June 1924 regarding ~~remitting that~~ The Sum of Rs 302 being the amount payable to the Govt Advocate ~~in~~ Coor for Services rendered by him in O S no 44 of 1918-9 on the file of the

31

Sub Judge, Bangalore,

Sir/Madam, Adverting to
my Letter No. [illegible], I am
directed to request that
the Hunsamaranahalli
Math authorities on
behalf of whom the
above suit was contested,
may be asked to pay
this amount from the
Math funds, and the
Report result reported
for orders of Govt.

I have the
honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient
servant
for Secretary to Govt.

16/7/24

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

WD 0563—GPB—2,500—27-7-22